SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Vol. VI, No. 6 | P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015 | April 1, 1976

Compromise Near on White House Science Office

Several rounds of staff conferences have worn down the differences between House and Senate bills to reopen the White House science office, and it now looks as though a final compromise will be sent to the President early this month. However, the recent negotiating and maneuvering surrounding the measure have been sufficiently peculiar, and often so petty, as to warrant a pre-passage report on the long-gestating legislation.

The latest development is that Gerald Ford, looking for all the friends he can find, last week suddenly whipped out a presidential message on science and technology, consisting of three-and-a-half typed pages addressed to the Congress of the United States. All that is contained therein is a rehash of the research and development portions of his recent budget message (SGR Vol. VI, No.2), and a plea for passage of the House version of the science office bill.

The message was hastily put together over the weekend of March 20-21, and released by the President at 12:30 p.m. March 22—so hastily, in fact, that some senior officials did not know they were due to appear at the White House until they arrived at work that morning.

As presidential messages on relatively serious matters go, this production is so skimpy as to raise the suspicion that Mr. Ford and his entourage are playing all the angles for collecting credit for something that the elders of the scientific community hold dear — a return to the White House. The facts of the matter, of course, are that the President showed no interest in undoing his predecessor's demolition of the science office until Vice President Rockefeller advised him that it would be a good thing to do. And then the President put his weight behind a fairly innocuous formulation — the House version — that does little more than provide desk space in the Executive Office building for a science adviser

(Continued on Page 2)

Reprieve for Space Telescope?

An unprecedented outburst of protests from astronomers in the United States, following the Administration's decision to delete funds for the Large Space Telescope (LST) from NASA's FY 1977 budget request (SGR Vol. VI, No. 2), has had an impact in Congress. Last week, the House passed an authorization bill for NASA which would restore sufficient LST funds to keep the project alive.

In addition, a recent meeting, jointly sponsored by the National Academy of Sciences and the European Science Foundation, expressed strong support for the LST, and held out the prospect of international cooperation in planning, and perhaps even funding, for the instrument. An international connection in the LST program could prove to be an important factor in preserving it from the axe.

An optical telescope planned for launch by the space shuttle in the early 1980s, the LST has consistently been accorded top priority by the Space Science Board of the National Academy of Sciences. But, in line with Mr. Ford's desire to hold down federal spending, the Office of Management and Budget removed all funds for LST from NASA's FY '77 budget request to Congress. The bill passed by the House last week would restore $3 million for the program — enough to continue with advanced planning and to begin constructing some of the instruments.

In Brief

One of Elliott Richardson's first acts upon taking over as Secretary of Commerce was to order a series of inhouse studies on US policies concerning energy, technology, and oceans. Richardson expressed concern that the US may be "underinvesting" in research; he also said that he would like to take the "emotionalism" out of debate on nuclear energy.

The 1970-71 decline in engineering enrollments, apparently induced by cutbacks in aerospace job opportunities, is showing up in the latest graduation figures. For all degree levels, last June's graduating class was the smallest in 7 years, while the number of bachelor degrees dropped to the 1959 level. New enrollments, however, have shot up (see page 6).

With not much else to do these days, NASA is building a house — an "energy-efficient" house that incorporates a lot of space technology into its heating and cooling systems. The job is being handled by NASA's Technology Utilization Program, which says the house is intended to be in the $40,000-$50,000 range, and that over a period of 20 years, its advanced energy-saving systems could save $20,000.

HEW's National Center for Educational Statistics reports that "only 46.6 per cent of 17-year olds can interpret a traffic ticket."

. . . Engineers Lobby for a Place in the Title

(Continued from Page 1)

and a small staff.

With the House having passed its bill November 6, the legislative hangup began on February 4, when the Senate, after lengthy dickering among three committees that agreed to share jurisdiction on the measure, came out with its version. Problems of compromise between the two chambers arose at once, starting with the title of the new office. The House bill, bearing the stamp of the White House, called for the creation of an Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP). The Senate bill, however, called for — among many other differences — the creation of an Office of Science, Technology, and *Engineering* Policy (OSTEP).

The difference is negligible and apparently came about without much thought or particular motive beyond a semantic nod to the engineers, who had strongly supported re-establishment of the office. However, once it was in there, the major engineering societies reacted with alarm when they learned that the House and the Administration wanted to eliminate "Engineering" from the title. Letters of protest arrived in Congressional offices from members of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, and the National Society of Professional Engineers.

The literary barrage then ignited a round of counter-protests from non-engineering professionals who contended that if engineers are accorded recognition in the title of the office, then, why not agriculturists, physicians, or biologists?

As the House and Senate staff members met with each other and White House aides to work out a compromise on the substantive parts of the bill, the nonsensical matter of the title proceeded to mushroom into an issue. The House staffers took the position that they were working for their members and had no authority to tinker with something so basic as the title of the House-passed bill. The White House people wavered back and forth, and the Senate position depended upon which of the three committees the staff person came from. Probably one of the most influential voices on the subject will be that of NSF Director H. Guyford Stever, who currently serves as presidential science adviser. Stever told SGR that his view is that "science and technology are fields, while engineering is a profession." On that basis, he said, Engineering does not belong in the title.

At the National Academy of Engineering, a staff member reported that the organization is staying out of the controversy, which, as he saw it, "is taking on the aspects of a matter of honor" among the various contenders.

On more serious parts of the legislation, the Senate side has backed down from its insistence that the new office should have a powerful voice in budget matters. The bill passed by the Senate states that the office should spell out the various things that might be accomplished with different levels of spending for research and development. In a compromise that has been worked out at the staff level, and approved by Administration representatives, this has been reduced to mere statement of the wonders that can be wrought by research and development — without any dollar amounts specified. With no authority to go into money matters, the office will be no nuisance for the Office of Management and Budget, which is to the Administration's liking.

Still to be resolved is a Kennedy-inspired provision that calls for a one-time $200,000 appropriation to each state for science and technology planning. This scheme runs counter to the Administration's preference for non-categorical revenue sharing, and it is not clear as to

(Continued on Page 3)

Nuclear Agency Chief in New Post

President Ford has nominated William A. Anders, chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC),to be Ambassador to Norway. Anders, who has been NRC chairman since it was established in January 1975, has been a controversial administrator, steering NRC on a more independent course than most observers expected. Ford has nominated NRC Commissioner Marcus A. Rowden, a former chief counsel of the Atomic Energy Commission to succeed Anders. Both appointments are subject to Senate confirmation.

Science & Government Report © 1976

Contributing Editors
Colin Norman, Pamela Moore

Editor and Publisher
Daniel S. Greenberg

Circulation Manager
Alice Anne Freund

Independently published by *Science & Government Report,* Inc., twice monthly, except once each in January, July and August. Annual subscription: Institutions, $65 (two years, $120); individuals, $44 (two years, $75). Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St., N.W., Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. Second class postage paid at Washington, DC. Please address all subscription correspondence to Box 6226A, Northwest Station, Washington, DC 20015. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on Xerox University Microfilms.

Freeze Recommended on Training of Medical Specialists

A committee of the Institute of Medicine has advised Congress that there are too many medical specialists and not enough general practitioners — and that the federal government ought to use its spending powers to do something about the imbalance.

The committee, chaired by Adam Yarmolinsky, a University of Massachusetts professor and lawyer who has been around the government-academe-foundation circuit for years, was created in response to a Congressional request for advice on an assortment of problems related to Medicare and Medicaid, the two big founts of federal money for health care.

The committee's report reflects the growing consensus that medical training and practice are out of whack with the nation's health needs, particularly in regard to developing patterns that will improve the quality of health care and help hold down costs. In this regard, a large number of studies all point to the conclusion that specialists, particularly surgeons, manage to find business sufficient to produce ample incomes, without any discernable relationship between their volume of work and the overall health of the population. Meanwhile, the studies show, large segments of the population are without adequate primary care, and efforts to promote preventive medicine — a major goal of federal health planners — are lagging for lack of general practitioners.

The solution offered by the Yarmolinsky committee calls for a freeze, starting in July 1977, that would hold all postgraduate speciality training outside of general practice to the number of slots filled as of July 1975. At the same time, there would be an expansion of slots for general practice, which includes internal medicine and pediatrics.

To carry out these shifts, the committee recommended the statutory creation of a 13-member "quasi-public independent physician manpower commission to monitor the speciality distribution of physicians to determine the appropriate number of residency slots for each speciality."

The implementation of the commission's determinations would be entrusted to the organizations that control accreditation of residency programs. But if within three years, the Secretary of HEW finds the system to be ineffective, the committee recommended that legislation should be sought to reconstitute the commission as an adviser to the Secretary and to give him power to withhold Medicare and Medicaid funds from residency programs in specialties that are considered oversupplied.

Since Medicare and Medicaid permeate the hospital industry throughout the country, the effect of the proposals would be to regulate the specialties at the point of entry.

Another recommendation concerns foreign medical graduates, who now comprise about one-third of the house officers in teaching hospitals and about one-fifth of all licensed physicians in the US.

Back in the days when the foreign graduates made up for a big shortage of American-trained physicians, US authorities rationalized their presence on the grounds that their home countries eventually benefited from their American experience. Relatively few of them, however, went home, but since they were useful here, little notice was given to the fact that medically impoverished countries were subsidizing health care in the US.

Now that American medical schools will soon be pouring forth graduates in sufficient numbers to fill our hospital staffing needs, a new perception of the problem is taking over. As stated by the Yarmolinsky committee, "Projected numbers of the United States graduates indicate that by the mid-1980s, they will fill almost all the currently existing graduate education slots."

Since the number of slots will decline if the committee's recommendations on speciality training are followed, it now appears that the US can eventually get along quite nicely without imported physicians. Therefore, the committee suggested "the removal of medicine as a shortage profession" from US immigration standards.

WHITE HOUSE *(Continued from Page 2)*

who will yield.

The archives of presidential messages on science and technology are quite thin, since the only other occupant of the file is the March 1972 message that President Nixon sent to Congress. Ten pages in length, the Nixon message was a fairly detailed and original document that spelled out ambitious proposals ranging from defense research to a plan for big money prizes for "innovations in key areas of public concern." It was later announced that the prizes would be up to $50,000 each, and nominations were actually collected and checks written out for the winners. But as Nixon moved into the 1972 election season, his advisers noted that most, if not all, of the winners were major league corporate researchers, and his advisers said that might not look good. The prize plan was then abandoned, without announcement, and never revived. As for the rest of Nixon's message on science and technology, the General Accounting Office searched for its effects last year — and reported it could find none.

In that respect, Mr. Ford's message does have an advantage: It promises nothing beyond the budget request that he sent to Congress in January and it urges Congress to do what it is very close to doing anyway. —DSG

Solar Energy Institute: Small is Cheaper . . .

Following months of bickering within the Administration and much pork-barrel politicking by several states, the Energy Research and Development Administration (ERDA) on March 15 finally came up with detailed plans for the startup phase of the Solar Energy Research Institute (SERI), a Congressionally mandated facility which may become the centerpiece of the federal government's solar R&D program (SGR Vol. V, No. 17).

ERDA's plans for SERI have been considerably pared by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) over the past few months, however, to the extent that the version unveiled last month would represent such a modest undertaking that it is sure to encounter considerable scorn from SERI's creators and proponents on Capitol Hill.

In contrast to formal advice, given ERDA last October by a committee of the National Academy of Sciences, that SERI should be a major national laboratory with a budget of $50 million by 1980, ERDA has proposed that during the first three years of its life, SERI should be little more than a management and research team at an existing institution. Though the plan also includes the possiblitiy that SERI will move into its own building and grow into a major undertaking early in the 1980s, there is no guarantee that the facility will ever attain such a standing. According to Robert Hirsch, Assistant ERDA Administrator for Solar, Geothermal and Advanced Energy, the growth of SERI will depend on its performance and the availability of money. "Nobody wants to create an institute for the sake of creating an institute," he said.

When Congress created SERI as part of the Solar Energy Research, Development and Demonstration Act of 1974, it left ERDA to decide the detailed operations of the Institute and asked the Academy to provide advice on its role and scope. Though Congress did not spell out its own views on SERI, the unwritten assumption was that the facility would become a major national laboratory along the lines of Oak Ridge or Los Alamos, and that it would provide something of a counterweight to ERDA's large nuclear labs.

That assumption was certainly shared by an Academy committee which recommended last year that SERI should be a big, single site operation with responsibility for planning and analyzing research strategies and carrying out its own research programs. The Academy recommended that SERI should swell in three years to that $50-million-a-year level and employ some 630 professionals in a total staff of 1500.

Some ERDA officials also shared that notion. But OMB did not. Earlier this year it vetoed ERDA's plans for a large institute and Mr. Ford's budget request contained no money specifically earmarked for SERI buildings. Moreover, ERDA had put in for a total budget of $255 million for solar R&D in FY 1977, but OMB sanctioned only $116 million. Shortly after the budget was sent to Congress, John M. Teem, then ERDA's Assistant Administrator for Solar, Geothermal and Advanced Energy, quit the fight and returned to private life.

The proposal unveiled last month was therefore largely the work of Hirsch, Teem's successor, who argued at a press conference that by starting SERI off modestly and providing for phased growth, it would be able to get under way much more quickly than if it were immediately given a large budget and a separate building. The proposal took the form of an invitation for public or private outfits to bid for a five-year contract to operate SERI.

In the first year, the contract would be worth $4-6 million, to support a professional staff of 50-75 people, and after three years the operation is expected to grow

(Continued on Page 5)

Dr. Mason, Meet Dr. Mason

"So the biggest problem impeding the contribution of nuclear power in meeting the nation's energy needs appears to me to be the lack of informed public understanding . . . The nuclear industry has shown it can supply safe and clean power, yet the voices raised against it — many of which clearly are not fully informed — continue to insist that nuclear power is unacceptable. A reasoned and dispassionate discussion of nuclear power and its alternatives — a more informed public understanding — is vitally needed . . . The technology is in hand, but public confidence may not be."

From remarks by Commissioner Edward A. Mason, US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, March 4, at MIT.

"As we interpret our mandate, NRC has no responsibility to promote the nuclear option ... Careful study of the Reorganization Act (that created NRC) reveals how it reflects public and Congressional concerns over recent nuclear developments. Congress intended to create a strong and independent regulatory agency in the nuclear energy field, with no promotional functions. This intent reflected concerns over the apparent erosion of public confidence in nuclear regulation. It probably was also intended to be responsive to allegations of AEC bias in regulatory decisions."

From remarks by Commissioner Edward A. Mason, March 11, Tokyo.

. . . Decision Schedule Avoids Political Role

SOLAR *(Continued from Page 4)*

to $10-20 million and 150-300 people. ERDA is therefore asking for proposals from outfits capable of providing that number of staff, and it is also asking them to provide an option on a nearby 300-acre site into which SERI could move at a later date if ERDA decides that a large institute is required. Hirsch said that a decision on whether or not such expansion will take place is likely to be made in two or three years time.

At least ERDA did win one battle with OMB. In the early negotiations, OMB argued that SERI should concern itself only with policy analysis, but ERDA's view that it should also conduct R&D prevailed.

Though the scaled down plan for SERI represents a more modest scientific prize than many state officials were expecting, there is still expected to be fierce competition for the site. Several states have established committees to plan their strategies to capture SERI, and ERDA has already been inundated with inquiries about the contracting procedure. The Institute has also featured in Presidential primary campaigns, with Ford in particular promising Florida officials that their state would get "excellent consideration" in the SERI sweepstakes.

Hirsch said last month that he expects to receive proposals from all 50 states, and noted that although the plan calls for a 300-acre site with "operational capability," consideration will not be limited only to those states fortunate enough to receive a lot of sunlight. There should not be a "knee-jerk assumption" that the thing will be located in the sunny southwest, he said.

ERDA is anxious to assure people that SERI's location will be decided fairly, and according to "factual" criteria, rather than by pork-barrel politics, and the timetable it has mapped out will at least take the decision out of the Presidential election race. Proposals must be submitted by July 15, they will be evaluated by mid-November by an ERDA source evaluation board, and ERDA Administrator Robert C. Seamans Jr. will make the final selection in December, in time for start-up in January 1977. That timetable eliminates the possibility that Mr. Ford will be able to toss the Institute to a particular state in return for expected electoral support.

Finally, it should be noted that since SERI was established by Congress, it is unlikely that OMB will be able to stunt its growth permanently. One key Congressional source told SGR last week that Congress will probably accept the phased growth embodied in ERDA's plan, but the key will be how fast it grows."—CN

High-Vacuum Prose: 50 Deans Produce a Study

Any document composed and supported by the graduate deans of 50 major universities must necessarily emerge as prose mush, especially when the deans have been assigned the task of figuring out feasible means of keeping their workplaces alive at a time when they are increasingly producing unemployables. The product of such an exercise is a newly issued study, "The Research Doctorate," a report to the Association of American Universities by the Association of Graduate Schools. Following are some choice excerpts:

In general, the students emerging from our graduate schools will be most useful to the society over the long term if they have been soundly educated in one of the basic disciplines, but simultaneously made aware of the perishability of knowledge and of the relations between fields. A premium should be placed upon the spirit of inquiry and upon an attitude of flexibility toward eventual application of the student's abilities and experience. In general, the university system, and particularly the individual research supervisor, should encourage students in an open attitude toward the relative status of jobs outside the academic community. Increased flexibility of this kind is probably more important than curricular or structural changes in graduate education. . .

The current period of slow increase in graduate enrollments coupled with a decrease in real terms of research funds generates both problems and opportunities. The opportunities are to assess the functions of graduate education for a future that will differ markedly from the past, and to concentrate on quality. The problems include assimilating the shift from a psychology of growth to one of stability, learning to innovate by substitution rather than by expansion, and rethinking the considerations that should properly govern the size of graduate enrollments. In the last connection, we believe that the appropriate size of graduate enrollments should be determined by the free choice of individual students tempered by an awareness of career opportunities, and not by institutional needs during the comparatively brief period of graduate study.

Academy Physicists Protest Trial of Soviet Dissident

The Federation of American Scientists (FAS) last month made public a petition, signed by more than half the physicist members of the National Academy of Sciences, protesting the imminent trial of Soviet physicist Andrei Tverdokhlebov and asking Soviet authorities to allow international observers at the trial.

The petition, sponsored by Nobel prize winners Hans Bethe and Owen Chamberlain, was circulated among Academy members at the height of the dispute between FAS Director Jeremy J. Stone and Academy President Philip Handler over the Academy's passive public role in supporting harrassed foreign dissidents (SGR Vol. VI, No. 1).

Stone, who believes that the Academy should take a more aggressive public stance in such matters, decided that FAS should take the initiative and seek the support of Academy members for the petition. The response suggests that there is a good deal of support within the Academy for public protest on such issues.

The petition, which was made known to Soviet Ambassador Anatoliy Dobrynin in January, was made public last month when news reached the West that Tverdokhlebov's trial was about to take place. A physicist who had long campaigned for human rights in the Soviet Union, Tverdokhlebov was arrested in April 1975 and charged with anti-Soviet slander.

A founding member of Sakharov's Human Rights Committee and the first secretary of the Moscow Amnesty International group, Tverdokhlebov could face a lengthy prison term if he is convicted. He has already been held in prison well beyond the 9-month Soviet limit for pre-trial detention.

Meanwhile, the spat between Handler and Stone has dropped out of public sight unresolved. In an angry letter to FAS Chairman Philip Morrison last December, Handler offered to provide details of the Academy's record of behind-the-scenes negotiations on behalf of beleagured Soviet scientists. Morrison accepted the offer, and promised to publicize the Academy's doings in the FAS newsletter.

No such document has been provided to FAS, however, although George Hammond, the Academy's Foreign Secretary, did agree to an interview with Stone. An Academy spokesman noted last week that since most of the negotiations between Academy officials and their Soviet counterparts took place in confidence, the Academy would be reluctant to have details of them published in the FAS newsletter.

ERDA Study Discounts Manpower Shortage

In sharp conflict with a number of predictions that serious shortages of skilled manpower will eventually limit efforts to expand energy supplies in the United States, a forecast prepared for the Energy Research and Development Administration (ERDA) has concluded that "technical manpower shortages which might hinder the nation's fossil and other energy programs are not likely to occur."

The forecast, produced by Bernard S. Friedman, a manpower consultant, proceeds from the observation that "historically, forecasts dealing with the demand for and supply of physical science and engineering manpower have been off the mark." In particular, Friedman argues, predicted shortages or surpluses of skilled manpower have mostly failed to take account of simple laws of supply and demand.

One of the most widely publicized projections of manpower for the energy industry, published in 1975 by the respected National Planning Association (SGR Vol. IV, No. 20), suggested that because enrollment in engineering courses was expected to decline, the energy industry would require an increasing share of each year's graduates. Eventually, the NPA projection suggested, the proportion required for energy programs would be so large as to be totally unrealistic.

But Friedman argues that precisely because shortages of engineers have been predicted, more people will opt for engineering courses. Such a shift in enrollment patterns may, in fact, already be taking place because, according to preliminary figures produced by the Engineering Manpower Commission, Fall 1975 enrollments were running about 20% above the previous year's enrollments.

If enrollment in engineering courses continues to hold up, Friedman suggests that the energy industry will be able to recruit sufficient numbers of physical scientists and engineers, provided a few relatively mild corrective actions are taken. Such actions include intensifying efforts to attract the thousands of young people who now move out of science and engineering immediately after graduating; encouraging students to transfer during their education into related courses whose graduates are in short supply, and increasing the

(Continued on Page 7)

Britain to Reprocess Japanese Nuclear Fuel

While arguments continue to reverberate in the United States about the adequacy of safeguards against the theft of nuclear material, the British government last month gave the go-ahead for up to 4000 tons of spent reactor fuel from Japan to be reprocessed in Britain.

Though there has been little organized opposition to nuclear power in Britain, the Japanese deal has been at the center of a heated controversy for the past few months. It has also been the subject of a lengthy, open government inquiry — a rarity in Britain, where the government usually likes to conduct its business and take decisions without going through the annoying ritual of seeking public opinions.

The government's decision on the matter was, nevertheless, expected. The impending deal which astonishingly, came to public notice only through a press leak, could bring in as much as $1.2 billion in the 1980s and create jobs in the depressed Northwest of Britain, weighty factors when compared with the speculative dangers from international terrorism and nuclear proliferation.

Announcing the government's approval of the deal last month, Energy Minister Anthony Wedgwood Benn said that the government had given "full consideration to the safety and environmental implications of accepting more work of this kind." He noted that the approval could open the way for reprocessing contracts to be signed with other countries, with as much as 6000 tons of spent fuel from foreign reactors being reprocessed in Britain in the 1980s.

The Japanese contract (which might be shared with France, though the details have yet to be worked out) would cover the treatment of 4000 tons of fuel, starting in 1979. The reprocessing, which would be carried out at Winscale in Cumbria, would involve the recovery of uranium and plutonium from spent reactor fuel, and all materials, including radioactive wastes, would be returned to Japan.

During debate about the deal in Britain, there has been much talk of Britain being turned into an international "nuclear dustbin." But, in sharp contrast with the reprocessing debate in the United States, the adequacy of safeguards against the theft of potential bomb ingredients received scant attention.

While the debate was in progress, British Nuclear Fuels Ltd., the semi-public corporation which operates the Winscale plant, conducted a public relations exercise to demonstrate that it is well able to handle radioactive materials in a safe manner. Unfortunately, a ship carrying radioactive fuel broke down, and a train running from the port of Barrow to Winscale was derailed. There was no leakage of radioactive material.

MANPOWER *(Continued from Page 6)*

productivity of professionals by greater use of para-professionals or technicians.

If shortages still develop, Firedman notes that they could be overcome by temporarily lifting immigration controls for people with the requisite skills.

(Copies of the report, *Fossil Energy Technical Manpower, Forecasts of Supply and Demand,* are available free of charge from ERDA Fossil Energy Research, University Programs, 20 Massachusetts Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20545.)

Appointments: Communications, NIH

William J. Thaler, chairman of the physics department at Georgetown University, has been appointed chief scientist of the Office of Telecommunications Policy (OTP), which is part of the Executive Office of the President. Thaler formerly directed the field projects branch of the Office of Naval Research. He will join OTP on a fulltime basis in May.

●

Joseph G. Perpich, a physician and lawyer who is a professional associate at the Institute of Medicine, has been appointed Associate Director for Program Planning and Evaluation at the National Institutes of Health.

Subscription Form

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

☐ Renew my subscription ☐ Check enclosed

☐ Enter my subscription ☐ Please bill

Institutional subscribers: one year, $65☐ ; two years, $120☐

Individual subscribers: one year, $44☐ ; two years, $75☐

(Overseas airmail, $17.50 per year additional.)

Name_____

Address_____

_____

Zip

Career Diplomat to Head State Dept. Science Office

Frederick Irving, a 54-year-old career Foreign Service Officer who most recently was ambassador to Iceland, had been appointed Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs (OES). The post has been vacant since last June, when Dixy Lee Ray, former chief of the Atomic Energy Commission, stomped out after 6 months' in office, charging that she had been virtually ignored by Secretary of State Kissinger and his senior associates. The choice of a career officer and nonscientist to fill the Department's most science-related post suggests that Kissinger has had enough of scientific prima donnas, and prefers an old hand who will mesh easily with the bureaucracy.

OES traces back to 1951, when the Department, mainly as a sop to the scientific community, set up a small science office that almost disappeared from sight after the opening ceremonies. In various resucitations over the years, it was always headed by a scientist, and almost always ignored, until 1964, when Herman Pollack, a career administrator with the Department, was put in charge. Under Pollack, the office experienced a rapid expansion of staff, particularly in science attache posts abroad. But Congress held the impression that in terms of influence, a good deal was left to be desired. On the eve of Pollack's retirement, in 1974, legislation was passed to draw together all State Department activities in environment, oceans. and science, and put them under an assistant secretary of state (SGR Vol. IV, No. 15).

Ray was the first occupant of that elevated post, but from the start, the independent-minded biologist did not get on well with her protocol-minded colleagues. Upon resigning, she issued a blast which said, in part:

"For some time, I had hoped that my office and the Bureau I head would play a significant part in the formulation of the State Department's science policy and in the provision of information upon which to base policy in those areas of technology specifically assigned to the OES by Congress.

"Unfortunately, that desirable condition has not been fulfilled. Many of the areas for which OES has statutory responsibility are, in fact, being pursued in other bureaus and offices" (SGR Vol. V, No. 13).

Irving's appointment settles one minor fracas inside the Ford Administration. Political flunkies of the President wanted to get some mileage out of the vacancy by filling it with a Republican loyalist of no particular qualifications for the job. Kissinger, however, prevailed, and the post has gone to someone who at least knows his way around the Department.

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

Second class postage paid
at Washington, D.C.

-00006 99/99
XEROX UNIV MICROFILMS
300 N ZEEB RD
ANN ARBOR MI 48106